

# Annual Corporate Evaluation Report 2000

*Evaluation Unit*

*International Development Research Centre June 2000*

## Table of Contents

### Introduction

Table 1: Strategic Areas Addressed in ACE 2000

Table 2: Summary of IDRC Funding for Projects Featured in ACE 2000

### Section I: Sustained Support

Evaluation of Twenty Years of IDRC Project Support in the Central Andes of Bolivia and Peru

An Assessment of Twenty Years of Research and Collaboration between China and IDRC

### Section II: Organizational Development

Integrated Learning Spaces: BAIF'S Approach to M & E

The West Africa Rural Foundation: An Examination of IDRC's Role in Organizational Development

### Section III: Evaluation Abstracts

Urban Agriculture Research

Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia

Women's Test Plot Activities in Nagaland

External Reviews of Program Initiatives

## Appendices

### Evaluation Reports Received by the Evaluation Unit, 1999/2000

*All documents mentioned in this report can be obtained from the IDRC library.*

## Introduction

The Annual Corporate Evaluation (ACE) Report is an element of the Centre's performance monitoring and reporting system. It provides the Board of Governors with an overview of evaluation activities at IDRC, highlights for Senior Management new evaluation tools, activities and findings from recent evaluation reports, and gives programming units an opportunity to showcase recent evaluations. The 2000 ACE Report covers 8 evaluation studies, selected for their quality, innovation, corporate relevance and timeliness, relating to over 270 projects funded over 20 years. IDRC grants to these projects totalled approximately CAD 45 million. Both the level of funding and the number of projects covered this year are much higher than usual due to the inclusion of two reviews of Centre support covering twenty years each - one on farming systems research in the Andes, the other on Centre collaboration and support in China. Table 2 on page 4 summarizes the resources represented in the evaluations featured in this ACE Report.

Given that evaluation in IDRC is decentralized and learning-oriented, studies are initiated by IDRC partners, regional offices, programming units, senior management or the Evaluation Unit to serve specific needs or purposes. Therefore, the pieces featured in the ACE Report usually cover a wide range of issues. The key strength of our decentralized, learning-based system is ownership and use of evaluation findings by our programming units. In addition it leads to considerable experimentation with methods and approaches which focus on learning rather than accountability. A weakness is that the annual output of reports tends to focus on a wide range of topics, which makes corporate synthesis and comparison difficult. For example, concerns and criticisms raised by the evaluators tend to be specific to the case in question and are not easily generalizable. This year's set of evaluations is no exception in terms of the variety of purposes and issues addressed.

The following table summarizes the areas as addressed by each of the studies highlighted in the pages that follow.

**Table 1: Four Strategic Areas Addressed by Evaluations Highlighted in the 2000 ACE Report.**

		Section II	Section III
--	--	------------	-------------

	Section I							
	Andes	China	BAIF Org.	West African Rural Foundation	Cities Feeding People (Nairobi)	Cities Feeding People (Costa Rica)	EEPSEA Secretariat	Nagaland Special Project (NEPED)
Sustained support	X	X	X	X			X	X
Outcomes	X				X	X	X	X
Capacity- building	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Organizational Learning		X	X		X	X		X

As IDRC celebrates its 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary and begins implementation of a new corporate program framework, it is appropriate that **Section I** of this year's ACE Report features two evaluations of the Centre's sustained support in two different regions: the Andes and China. The review of farming systems research (FSR) in Peru and Bolivia was designed to document the outcomes of innovative research aimed at understanding and modifying established community practices in order to find practical solutions to local development problems. In contrast, the primary purpose of assessing twenty years of successful collaboration between China and IDRC was to draw lessons about IDRC's approach to supporting development research, which both could apply in other scientific and technical cooperation contexts.

**Section II** features two examples of organizational development of Southern partners in India and Senegal. The piece on the way the Indian NGO, the BAIF Development Research Foundation, has institutionalized learning through monitoring and evaluation was based on a paper in which BAIF elaborates on its experience for the purpose of sharing it with African practitioners at the inaugural conference of the African Evaluation Association (held in Nairobi in September 1999 and supported by IDRC). The second article was based on a review of the West African Rural Foundation (WARF), in which the Evaluation Unit used elements of its organizational assessment model to plan future activities.

**Section III** presents abstracts of four evaluation reports from among those completed this year by Program Initiatives (PIs), Secretariats, and special projects. These are reports from two Cities Feeding People (CFP) workshops, one in Nairobi, the other in Costa Rica, which were held to assist researchers to analyse and learn from the results of their urban agriculture projects. The third abstract is of an external evaluation of the Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA) which devotes particular attention to human resource development and research utilization. The article on the Women's Test Plot Activities in Nagaland is based on an external study aimed at assessing the effects of the Nagaland Environment Protection and Economic Development Action Project on the integration and strengthening of women's activities within the program. The section ends with reference to the external reviews of 12 PIs. These were undertaken in order to fulfill an accountability requirement and also to contribute to the reformulation of IDRC programming for the next planning cycle. The results of these studies are not highlighted here as they contributed to the material presented to the Board during the strategic framework approval process. They are currently being used by PIs to streamline and improve program foci and will be reflected in the updated prospecti and in the implementation of the next programming cycle.

There are four areas in which the findings of the studies highlighted in this ACE Report resonate with each other and/or with previous evaluation studies: sustained support, outcomes, capacity building, and organizational learning.

The importance of **IDRC sustaining its involvement and support** over a significant period of time was cited as a key factor in the results achieved in the Andes, China, BAIF, WARF, EEPSEA and Nagaland studies. This echoes the findings of many previous IDRC evaluations. In this context, it is interesting to note that the short duration of IDRC projects was one of the main concerns expressed by Chinese researchers.

Three studies reported **outcomes** related to the influence of research on government policies: the two urban agriculture studies and EEPSEA. These results came from *policy briefs and publications*, as well as the *involvement of project personnel in policy processes*. A lesson on outcomes from the Andes study, and also reflected in the urban agriculture work, is the importance of expecting *results only in the areas in which you work directly*. The Cities Feeding People PI has learned this lesson and has built a self-assessment system based on a list of eight outcome areas in which it expects to achieve project and program results. It uses this list to monitor its own performance and as a framework for consultation and discussion with its partners. The two other areas in which outcomes are reported are in *focussing attention on the needs and strengths of indigenous communities* (Andes, Nagaland) and in *fostering a systems approach* in development planning (Andes, Nagaland, Urban Agriculture).

Most of these studies comment on IDRC's achievements in several kinds of **capacity building**. *IDRC as a catalyst for new forms of cooperation or collaboration* between local organizations was cited in the Andes, China, EEPSEA and Nagaland studies. A second area of capacity-building included *strengthening the technical and research skills of individuals* through its close, collegial contact with partner institutions (Andes, China, WARF, Nagaland); its *devolution of responsibility and control to the southern partners* (WARF, Nagaland); and its *support of training, networking, publication, and evaluation* activities (China, BAIF,

Nagaland, WARF).

IDRC also influenced organizations to *adopt new research approaches* such as integrated or systems research, community-based participatory research, multi-disciplinary research and social sciences research. These changes, particularly in Peru, Bolivia and China, took long term, sustained involvement and tended to both influence and be influenced by the evolution of IDRC's own understanding and application of these research concepts. IDRC's ability to *select strategically partners with high potential for grow and influence* were also reported as important to achieving these results (Andes, WARF). In the BAIF, China, Nagaland and Urban Agriculture cases IDRC fostered **organizational learning** through the use of gender analysis or monitoring and evaluation activities.

As usual, this year's ACE report concludes with a list of the reports that were added to the IDRC evaluation inventory over the past year (30), identifying the program areas which are related to each report.

While serving their respective project or program purposes, each of these studies may also touch on broader issues of corporate concern. While the depth of coverage on these issues may not be adequate for formulating immediate corporate lessons or policy-related conclusions, they build on the evidence IDRC is accumulating over the years and they can be used to signal potential areas of learning where more attention or more study would be useful.

**Table 2: IDRC Funding for the Projects Featured in ACE 2000**

		Number of Projects	Approximate Budget	Time
Section I	Andes	31	8,900,000	1977 - 1997
	China	150	25,000,000	1981 - 1998
Section II	BAIF	N/A	1,855,000	1988 - 1998
	WARF	4	1,200,000	1993 - 1998
	CFP: Nairobi	9	830,000	1987 - 1998

<b>III</b>	<b>EEPSEA</b>	75	1,920,000	1996 - 1999
	<b>Nagaland</b>	1	5,000,000	1995 - 2000
<b>Total</b>		278	45,295,000	

- 1. represents the budget of 28 out of the total 31 projects**
- 2. includes 9 separate grants: 6 research projects and 3 research support activities.**
- 3. includes 7 case studies and the information network AGUILA**
- 4. represents the budget of 5 out of the 8 projects**

## **Section I. Sustained Support**

This section features two evaluations of sustained Centre support for development research in two regions: the Andes and China. The report on 20 years of work with Andean communities in Bolivia and Peru comments on: the evolution and institutionalization of a new research approach for studying production in local farming systems; the permanence of such changes; and the results on local organizational and individual capacity development. The evaluation of 20 years of research collaboration between China and IDRC highlights the importance and value of the Centre's particular approach in supporting research for development projects as perceived by its Chinese partners.

### **Twenty Years of IDRC Project Support in the Central Andes of Bolivia and Peru [\(1\)](#)**

The report covers 30 IDRC-supported projects in the Andean region. It documents how they have influenced individuals, communities, organizations, education programs and research practices related to agricultural development in Peru and Bolivia over the last 20 years.

#### **Evolution of Research Approach: The Case of Farming Systems Research (FSR)**

IDRC-supported projects were intended to introduce FSR concepts into local organizations and the research community. This concept represented an evolution away from the single-crop production perspective, which dominated the agricultural research scene up to the 70s, towards a more holistic research perspective in which a greater diversity of the elements interacting in local production systems, could be included, studied and better understood as they influence local production. This change in the research approach has continued evolving further to what today the Centre defines as the Ecosystems Management approach.

Overall, IDRC-supported projects raised awareness, among researchers and community organizations, of the possibilities of using Andean products and knowledge as a valuable base for improving local production and development. A number of projects had the specific purpose of introducing a “production systems approach” to guide organizations working in Andean communities. The most representative examples are the PISCA (Andean Crops-Peru) project and PISA (Andean Farming Systems) project in Peru, as well as the Quinoa project in Bolivia. In all cases, the approach taken by the Centre was to contact the local organizations most directly linked to the targeted communities. Partnering with local organizations was seen as a necessary step to implement the programs that would reach the local communities. This choice implied certain compromises: some local organizations with stronger capacity were not as close to the area of work or to the communities as other, weaker, organizations. The latter, although more closely linked, needed to be strengthened in order to perform their role effectively as partners with IDRC. The decision to work with organizations closely related to communities in the region, mainly local universities and public agricultural research bodies, meant progress took longer but left behind stronger local organizations

### **Changes Influenced by IDRC's Presence in the Region**

The clearest most direct result was capacity building of the staff in participating organizations. Former project participants are now using the systems concept in their work at universities and in the public sector. The Universidad Nacional del Altiplano in Puno, Perú (M.Sc. Program for Rural Development) and the Colegio Andino del Cusco, (Environmental Management and Development, and Andean Regional Development programs) are cases where changes in teaching curricula and new degree programs have resulted.

In the public sector, the Director of the MERISS project (Irrigation in the Sierra and Rainforest) stated that because of having participated in an IDRC-supported project, he now refers to the systems approach when responding to demands for regional development. A second example of the transfer of the learning to current public sector is the Natural Resource Management in the Sierra and Rainforest project (MARENAS), where people previously involved in IDRC-supported projects, such as PISA and PISCA, are now bringing to the project a systems approach to natural resource management in the region.

This report suggests that, in both planning and evaluating future work, IDRC needs to realize that results are most likely to be achieved within a project's direct sphere of influence. This observation further supports previous Centre experience with measuring results. When IDRC-supported projects interact directly with research organizations or other types of intermediary actors - who, in turn, work with the local communities - outcomes in these communities should not be expected as a direct result of the project. Rather, IDRC should see itself as accountable for results in the intermediary organizations.

<h3><b>The Process of Institutionalization of Change and Organizational Development in the Andes</b></h3>
---

The PISCA (Andean Crops-Peru) and PISA (Andean Farming Systems) projects in Peru, as well as the Quinoa project in Bolivia had the specific intention to influence local organizations and to develop their organizational capacities by supporting FSR projects. The Centre did not make alliances with local NGOs during the early stages of project intervention. However, due to social and economic changes the NGO sector became a key actor in the development of the local communities in the region. In response to this, working relationships and collaborative alliances were put in place. The NGOs adopted the IDRC projects' values and practices and have become the vehicle for institutionalizing those principles the region.

Thus, in the highlands of Peru and Bolivia, organizational development happened as a result of influences beyond the IDRC-funded projects. Intended institutionalization of changes took place, but not through the organizations that the Centre initially identified nor through the means it defined from the outset. These outcomes provide good examples of the difficulty in attributing change to a particular intervention, the need for responsiveness towards unforeseen local opportunities, and the complexity of the interactions that lead to change in the local context. This case provides an insight into how IDRC's interventions can make key contributions to broader transformations.

## **An Assessment of Twenty Years of Research and Collaboration Between China and IDRC <sup>(2)</sup>**

Scientific and technical cooperation between China and the Centre started in 1981. IDRC's primary contact, the Ministry of Science and Technology, is responsible for coordinating co-operative research activities. Research has been supported in a variety of disciplines: agriculture, forestry, environment, information, economics and social development. In the early and mid-1980s, Centre efforts focussed on strengthening Chinese basic agricultural and forestry sciences using a systems approach to increasing production. The pattern adopted in forestry was frequently replicated for agricultural, fisheries, pest control, and even social science research. The approach consisted of two phases. The first included a combination of basic scientific research and field testing. The second usually involved wide spread dissemination of research outputs, through field-based training and popularization and through institutionalization in new centres attached to line agency research bodies.

### **Value of IDRC Approach to R&D in China**

- *IDRC has enabled Chinese research teams to interact with teams in many other countries. They are able to be, and feel to be, a part of the international scientific community. Other donors only facilitate interaction with researchers in their own country.*
- *IDRC projects have encouraged collaborative research within the country fostering linkages among different Chinese research teams.*
- *IDRC supports Chinese researchers to solve Chinese problems. Some other donors get Chinese researchers to collect data in China for analysis by researchers in the donor's country.*
- *The whole process of project preparation, management, accounting, monitoring and evaluation required by IDRC, has alerted the Chinese to international best practice*



*in research management.*

- *IDRC provides training not only for researchers but also for research managers. Few other donors do this.*

This review of IDRC's work in China was initiated by Chinese officials to draw lessons from what they perceive as a highly successful, long term, collaborative relationship. They sought the review to inform their own future activities in international scientific and technical collaboration. Consequently, the study placed special emphasis on describing the interactions between Centre staff and Chinese researchers. Through interviews with Chinese project leaders, team members, and IDRC Program Officers, the report identifies and features the characteristics that distinguish IDRC's interventions in, and support for, development research. A sample of what Chinese researchers deem valuable and unique in IDRC's approach is presented in the box below.

The review suggests that as the Centre began shifting its support away from a sole focus on production systems in the late 1980s and early 1990s, agricultural and forest sector work supported by the Centre began to look beyond production systems to integrate farmland and agro-forestry systems at the ecosystem and basin levels rather than just in test plots or research stations.

The reviewers cite some cases in which they are appreciative of the realism of the community-based and increasingly participatory efforts of IDRC-supported projects to address the complex forces affecting poor people in ecologically vulnerable and often remote areas. They also underline the important role IDRC staff, as trained researchers, play in the process of delivering effective support to projects by helping to: identify research partners in the developing world; design research proposals; monitor and assess ongoing research; and helping to build networks.

The evaluation indicated that IDRC fostered positive changes in China as a result of its twenty years of support, as now there is a greater willingness to make use of research results from both the natural and social sciences, and a stated desire to work further to build local research capacity in the social sciences. An area where IDRC support was seen as particularly important was in building acceptance and capacity in the social sciences as China moved towards a market system.

The review team identified Chinese researchers' main concerns about working with IDRC staff as: 1) an inability to communicate in Chinese; 2) brief field visits; and 3) the short project cycle. These elements were identified as obstacles in the development of innovations and limiting relations between the Centre and its partners. The Chinese also expressed a desire for more access to information and feedback from evaluations carried out by IDRC.

## Section II. Organizational Development

This section presents information on two institutions where IDRC has focussed specifically on strengthening the capacity of promising NGOs. The BAIF Development Research Foundation, is an example of a learning organization. It is developing a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) approach, called “Integrated Learning Spaces”, that provides a channel for regular reflection and improvement. The other case, based on an organizational assessment of the West African Rural Foundation, indicates the importance of IDRC's approach of providing sustained, flexible institutional support in the development of this unique African grant-making organization.

### Integrated Learning Spaces: BAIF's Approach to M&E [\(3\)](#)

This Indian NGO, focusing on integrated rural development, and on building a research base to support development decision-making, has evolved tremendously both structurally and programmatically since its first contact with the Centre over fifteen years ago. Many contributions have influenced this evolution, including the support of, and work with, IDRC programs, evaluation staff, and links with IDRC partners such as CIDA, IUCN (The World Conservation Union) and CARE Canada on evaluation issues.

BAIF's Principles for Guiding Evaluation
❖ Monitoring is for facilitation, not for control
❖ Evaluation is intended to improve, not to prove
❖ Analysis and reflection lead to learning for the future
❖ Learning should be continuous, not 'lumped'



BAIF has long had a keen interest in building its capacity in M&E. The internal hub for this work has been its M&E Cell, created in the mid-1980s, with IDRC support. Reorganizing itself at the end of the 1990s, BAIF has decentralized into state societies across much of India with BAIF headquarters in Pune acting as a coordinating centre by providing training, fund-raising, proposal development, and quality assurance.

In this configuration, M&E plays a strategic role as BAIF assists in program implementation and coordination its state societies. BAIF has therefore developed its own M&E approach. In its experience, evaluation handled by a team separate from the program implementors, or by a group external to the organization, led to “lumped learning” which made little contribution to improving program performance. The strategy BAIF came up with to change this trend is called “integrated learning spaces”.

The learning space regularly brings together implementors, managers, monitors, and external resource people for a rich, structured exchange of experiences and ideas. The structured discussion has as key elements: reviewing operations; deciding on trouble shooting; discussing issues arising out of implementation, assessing modes of technical capacity building; and reflecting on experiences, both internal and external to the team. The exchange of information is intended to lead incrementally to knowledge building and learning, and to applications of learning to shape future action. Through these learning spaces, the organization fosters the structured exchange of information and reviews and reflects on the process of development itself. This has led BAIF's Executive Vice-President to observe that "taking care of the process in this way, takes care of the planned results".

BAIF reports that this M&E approach has resulted in accelerated staff development, a quantum leap in participation by the communities, and improved outcomes. At the same time, those who participated consistently in the structured exchanges reported they were better able to fulfill their roles, thus increasing their capacity and creating a strong base for evaluation and program monitoring. BAIF's particular approach to M&E is an excellent example of a participatory method that effectively integrates implementation review, monitoring, and organizational learning. When presented during the inaugural meeting of the African Evaluation Association it drew considerable interest. BAIF has indicated the intention to refine and systematize the approach and make it portable to different working situations. Work in this direction will be included as a significant component of a \$3.1 million CIDA-funded project "Women's Health and Empowerment Project" with BAIF, IDRC's EcoHealth PI and the Evaluation Unit.

## **The West African Rural Foundation: An Examination of IDRC's Role in Organizational Development**

The West African Rural Foundation (WARF) is an international grant-making organization, located in Dakar, Senegal, that works in five countries of the sub-region. WARF supports capacity building for rural organizations based on participatory approaches to help them address and find solutions for the problems confronting their communities. IDRC and the Ford Foundation have been working with this unique African organization as the founding donors since its establishment in 1993. The programming and organizational strength of WARF can be credited to a number of factors including a shared vision among the staff, strong leadership from the Director and the Board of Governors, and a willingness to experiment without compromising the fundamental principles of participation and empowering local communities.

IDRC and the Ford Foundation have played an important part in the organizational development of WARF. The Evaluation Unit undertook to study these contributions while preparing an evaluation capacity building project with them in July 1999. Using elements of the IDRC-Universalia organizational assessment model, WARF's organizational capacity and motivation were reviewed through a series of key informant interviews with WARF, IDRC, and Ford Foundation program staff.

Findings such as those cited below could be useful in planning future activities.

- WARF's strength and relevance comes from the fact that it was created by, and is completely managed by, professional African researchers. IDRC's approach of supporting individual and organizational capacity building by devolving responsibility and control to the local organization encouraged success. IDRC responds to the needs WARF identifies as critical. The soundness of this approach is demonstrated by the fact that WARF operates in a similar manner with its own partners.
- Organizational development takes time and donor organizations like IDRC need to provide sustained support so that local talents can be nurtured, options can be explored, and full advantage can be taken of opportunities that arise. IDRC's financial support of WARF has been comparatively small, however, its influence has been disproportionately high. This is attributed by WARF staff to the intellectual and technical support provided by Centre staff on and of the significance of the trust and close relationships that have developed.
- WARF staff appreciated IDRC's willingness to take a chance with a nascent organization and to provide the opportunity to test various participatory approaches in order to determine which was most effective in helping rural communities. This flexibility and openness to experimentation permitted WARF to develop into a world-class applied research organization that is being courted by national governments, international donors, and the private sector. IDRC and the Ford Foundation shared a development philosophy that meant providing WARF the support and space it needed to develop its own identity and modus operandi.
- WARF's success is a tribute to the good working relationship and fundamental respect of those involved with its development from the beginning. The Africans, Canadians, and Americans involved in setting up WARF overcame any tensions and obstacles by being truly participatory and developing a common vision about the purpose of the organization.

### **Section III. Evaluation Abstracts**

The following four abstracts further illustrate the evaluation work this year among PIs and Special Initiatives. They provide examples of Centre contributions to: policy making and information networking in Urban Agriculture in Latin America and Africa; information networking and policy research for economic analysis on environmental problems in South East Asia; and initiatives for incorporating a women in development component as part of a project for natural resource management in India. Also included is a note regarding this year's external reviews of the Centre's 12 Program Initiatives.

#### **Urban Agriculture Research**

<b>Eight Main Areas Identified in CFP Evaluation Framework to Analyse Project and Program Results</b>
Human Resource Development
Institutional Capacity Strengthening
Effectiveness of Local Partnerships
Gender-Sensitive Analysis
Added-Value of Multi-disciplinary Approaches
Scientific and Methodological Advances
Research Utilization
Fund Leverage

The Cities Feeding People PI (CFP) has been supporting research in urban agriculture (UA) in Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean. In an attempt to provide their partners and the PI itself with tools to analyse and reflect on project results and program learning, CFP has developed a framework which identifies the 8 main areas where their projects are expected to contribute (see box). This year, two workshops used this framework for self-assessment, one in East Africa, and another in Central America. The results of these two workshops illustrate how a PI and its partners can work together to systematically monitor progress and share learning about the results achieved.

### **Reflections on Policy Impacts from the Nairobi Workshop [\(4\)](#)**

A report produced by Luc Mougeot presents the results of the Nairobi workshop on UA held in June 1998. During this workshop, a group of African CFP-funded researchers identified the major outcomes of their research. This analysis covers the period between 1987 to 1998, including 9 separate activities (six research projects and three research support activities) in the capital cities of 7 African countries. Participating researchers represented local university institutes or departments, NGOs and government agencies.

### **Identification of Main Contributions and Influence on Policy Changes**

The workshop identified strong contributions by UA research projects in the following areas: forming effective local partnerships, making scientific and methodological advances, and increasing the utilization of research results. At the policy level, local partnership and research utilization influenced changes in peri-urban land use, and were the basis for recommendations for policy plans and approved zoning provisions. Examples of these results include:

- In Kampala, the open public seminar on project results has contributed to changing Council authorities' attitudes. Previously The Council actively discouraged UA,

including the use of repressive practices. Now UA is fully recognized by the Kampala City Council (KCC) and features in meetings of all Council departments.

- The Kampala Urban Study Group (KUSG) used project results to argue for the recognition of UA as a legitimate urban land use. Official recognition was finally granted in the 1994 written provision of the Kampala Structure Plan (KSP), the main output of the KUSG's contribution to the World Bank funded first Uganda Urban Project.
- Project information was used in Dar es Salaam, by the Sustainable Dar es Salaam Development Project (SUDP) to instruct the Strategic Urban Development Plan for the city which replaces the city's 1979 master plan.

### **Incorporation of Context Analysis as part of Evaluation Framework**

The framework developed by CFP promotes consideration of contextual determinants of project results. For example, workshop participants identified the issue of “timeliness”, alluding to the project's relevance to current issues on the local political agenda. Disruption of city food supplies, deterioration of urban living conditions and the need for government responses were identified as elements which would “*favour the growth and accentuate the visibility of UA*”. These conditions were present in Dakar, Kampala and Dar es Salaam but not to the same extent in Harare, nor in Nairobi. Hence UA has played a less prominent role in the latter two cases.

According to participants the workshop gave them an enhanced understanding of their contributions to local development in diverse areas, including the policy-practice and policy-making spheres. Among the conclusions of the workshop there was general agreement on a positive change, in the attitudes of researchers, towards research and UA. To quote the workshop report:

*The effect of this exercise on the project leaders themselves was surprising: most stated they would henceforth as scientist look at research design and implementation in a new way. (p 6)*

### **The Red Aguila, Information Network in Latin American Urban Agriculture [\(5\)](#)**

In May 1999, CFP undertook an exercise similar to the one held in Nairobi but this time in Costa Rica for the Latin American region. Using the same 8-point framework, participants reflected on the contributions achieved by seven UA case studies in the region and the Latin American information network for UA called AGUILA.

According to an analysis of the case studies, the main advancements have taken place in developing methodologies for UA research. This workshop identified AGUILA's main contribution as the increased awareness and acceptance of UA potential benefits among local governments, research centres, universities and other international donors working in the region. Similar to the findings obtained in the Nairobi workshop, the workshop in Latin

America found that an increased awareness of UA benefits is a major factor leading to research utilization.

The report documents the role that AGUILA has played in promoting, facilitating and supporting the development of UA in the region as an alternative source of food, income and jobs. The case of AGUILA represents the first experience in the region of an UA network.

The RED AGUILA has been a source for information sharing. The network has played a wider role in promoting and supporting regional development of UA by disseminating local research results. Some examples include:

- In Bolivia, the **municipality of Montero**, in Santa Cruz, requested technical and financial assistance to develop strategies, development plans, and policies on UA.
- ❖ In Colombia, the **municipality** of Caldas, Antioquia, requested assistance to incorporate UA activities in their social development policies and projects.
- ❖ The Norwegian Agency for Development (**NORAD**) requested assistance to implement food-security projects using an UA approach in Honduras and Nicaragua.
- The United Nations Development Program (**UNDP**) requested technical cooperation to support and promote the regional implementation of UA projects in Latin America.
- The Inter-American Development Bank (**IDB**), Department for the Environment, has demonstrated interest in increasing information exchange on UA issues with AGUILA, particularly in the area of joint publications.

The following box describes some of the results achieved as reported in one of the case studies.

**The Case of Solid Waste Management and Urban Agriculture in the City of Santiago de los Caballeros, Dominican Republic**

In Santiago, the problem of urban solid waste management is one of the most serious concerns facing local inhabitants. However, the municipality lacks the technical and operational capacity to address this issue effectively. CFP supported a research initiative which assessed the magnitude of the problems and opportunities for solid waste management and UA in the city. The research project presented UA as a suitable alternative to address the problem. The research results identified three key sources of solid waste as: 1) a open space dump site, 2) the Yaque local market, and 3) the hospital.

In Santiago, the problem of urban solid waste management is one of the most serious concerns facing local inhabitants. However, the municipality lacks the technical and operational capacity to address this issue effectively. CFP supported a research initiative which assessed the magnitude of the problems and opportunities for solid waste management and UA in the city. The research project presented UA as a suitable alternative to address the problem. The research results identified three key sources of solid waste as: 1) a open space dump site, 2) the Yaque local market, and 3) the hospital.

Based on the results provided by the project, collaborative arrangements are in place among the municipality, private sector, students from the M.Sc program in Environmental Engineering, and the Ministry of Public

Health, to develop diverse solid-waste management plans. Research results have also provided two private sector enterprises, one local NGO, and the municipality, with the information to prepare projects to re-use organic solid waste from the Yaque market and other nearby neighbourhoods, and to incorporate it as compost for local urban agriculture initiatives.

## Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia <sup>(6)</sup>

*"The EEPSEA program must be regarded as a success on practically every dimension of its program. The training in environmental economics, the workshops and short courses, the quality of research output, and the emerging cohort of qualified environmental economists all suggest that the first six years have been remarkable indeed... These early successes should not be interpreted to suggest, however, that change is not desirable... These proposed changes do not suggest flaws in the current arrangements as much as they present a logical evolution in a program that must evolve as it matures." p. 14*

The Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA) was established in 1993 to support training and research in environmental and resource economics across its ten member countries of Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, the Philippines, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, China, Papua New Guinea, and Sri Lanka. Its goal is to strengthen local capacity for the economic analysis of environmental problems so that researchers can provide sound advice to policy makers. The program uses a networking approach to provide not only financial support but meetings, resource persons, access to literature, publication outlets, and opportunities for comparative research. It operates as a Secretariat out of the ASRO office, is supported by the most diverse funding group of any Secretariat and is matched only by Bellanet in the number of core donors supporting its work. According to an external evaluation completed in February 2000, EEPSEA is a good example of a learning organization that uses review to improve its program delivery. The report also notes that to build on and improve EEPSEA's work, its staffing needs to be augmented.

Initiated by EEPSEA's Sponsors' Group as a part of a regular evaluation cycle, the study recommends a consolidation of the gains which have been made. While the evaluators found that more than 75% of researchers contacted had taken on additional research in environmental economics following their links with EEPSEA, they note that many of the researchers who have been supported by EEPSEA in the past are lost to the network.

*"The tracer study showed not only very positive utilization but also "multiplier effects" of EEPSEA training research and other support services. Because most of the respondents are from academe, it is predictable that the utilization will be related to their teaching functions followed by research. EEPSEA has stimulated more learning and more research in the fields of environment and economics. Much less predictable but nevertheless [having] occurred, is the fact that alumni contributed much to local/national meetings and ... to the use of research results by local authorities. Through their ... participation in environment-related program and policy-making bodies, they have made inputs into the policy formulation and implementation process." p. 39*



The report proposes measures to maintain the active involvement of researchers to deepen their experience and increase their effective participation in future research and thereby influence policy. The review proposes broadening the EEPSEA network to involve more research and environmental organizations in the region. More active use of the media is recommended. For courses supported by EEPSEA, it is proposed that more of these be offered in member countries rather than being centralized in Los Banos. This would permit a wider range of participants from other countries, increasing the reach of the program and expanding the potential for policy influence.

### **Women's Test Plot Activities in Nagaland [\(7\)](#)**

The Nagaland Environment Protection and Economic Development Action Project (NEPED), is implemented by the Government of Nagaland (North East India) and funded by IDRC and CIDA through the India-Canada Environment Facility (ICEF). The NEPED project was initiated in February 1995 with the goal of integrating agroforestry methods into the traditional slash and burn (jhum) shifting cultivation system of the region. Almost 80% of communities in the region use the jhum practice. They cultivate for the first two years following the slash and burn, and then leave the field fallow for 7-12 years. The project seeks to address the problem of increased soil depletion triggered by population pressure and the consequent reduction in the jum cycle.

In 1996, based on gender analysis early in the project, a gender component was added to NEPED in order to better integrate women into the program. A series of women's empowerment training programs were begun, focussing on the perceived strengths and weaknesses of women, land issues, access to and control over resources, and participation in decision-making. Women were also given the opportunity to independently carry out test plot activities.

A 1999 evaluation assessed the experiences and activities of NEPED's women's program and found that it has had a positive effect on women. To date, 213 women from 123 villages have been involved in the women's empowerment training. Between 1996 and 1998, 93 Women's Test Plots and 80 Women's Tree Nurseries have been established. Women have cultivated crops in jhum fields; they have increased their knowledge of tree plantations by actively participating in land shaping and saplings selection; they have become involved in other NEPED activities such as tree nurseries; they have taken the initiative to learn about land issues and to join together to buy land collectively; women leaders have emerged in many villages; and, many have earned money by working on the plantation. NEPED has also demonstrated a new gender-inclusive model to the state, which is being sensitized to the idea of integrating women into programs and has provided a model for women to gain direct access to government resources.

Although the evaluation found that NEPED was continuing to learn about and improve its

gender sensitive programming, it did identify some areas of concern. For example, training should concentrate on the technical aspects of the project, and the ownership and sharing of land should be given greater attention. The report also noted that future projects should include more careful monitoring of women's participation, additional local resource people for training, more careful assessment of the geographical limitations of the project site, and more involvement of project staff in the study of gender issues.

#### Self-Assessment of NEPED Workshop in Kohima, October 1999

In its efforts to build internal evaluation capacity, NEPED applied Outcome Mapping in a self-assessment of the project. Outcome Mapping was employed to capture the changes in behaviours which NEPED has helped support to meet its objectives. The self-assessment did not replace an external review of the project. Rather it captured, from the perspective of the project team, the most important and salient events (both positive and negative) in the accomplishments of the project, and assisted to understand the factors which have contributed to program's success. Outcome Mapping offered a learning oriented approach and the intent was that the findings would help the team define their activities for the remainder of the project as well as learn from their experiences. In addition, it prepared the team effectively for an external review carried out several months later by CIDA.

- *NEPED Self-Assessment Report*. By NEPED Project Team. December 1999.

- *Nagaland Environmental Protection and Economic Development Project. Performance Assessment*. Inidia-Canada Environment Facility. By External Evaluation Team Richard Baerg, Surendra Kumar Vettivel, and Dipa Singh Bagai. February 2000.

## External Reviews of Program Initiatives

At the request of Programs Branch, the Evaluation Unit coordinated an external review of twelve PIs in the spring / summer of 1999. The review was carried out to provide an independent perspective, and to meet an obligation to the Board of Governors for external comment on PI performance. Common terms of reference were developed for all the reviews with emphasis on two primary issues:

1. comment on the relevance of the research **approach** in the PI; and
2. comment on the relevance, quality and nature of **results** achieved to date.

The reviews were conducted by a team of two reviewers for each PI, selected for their experience in the field of study as well as their geographic knowledge of the areas in which the PI works. Where possible, reviewers participated in the review of more than one PI in order to generate an understanding of different approaches in use across the Centre. In total 17 reviewers were involved; many were Canadian, but the team also included members from India, Mexico, South Africa and the UK. They each brought many years of experience to the review and came from universities, the private sector, independent consultants, as well as other agencies. Limited primarily to interview and documentary evidence, this external review was

seen as one input to a review process which also included an internal Centre review of each PI, PI annual reports, evaluations completed, and a management review. The results of the reviews have been used by Programs Branch Management, together with the other sources cited above, in the program re-design process and in refining programming strategies. In its review of the new corporate strategic program framework, the Board was provided with the external review results. The PIs are also using the external review findings as discussion points in their program planning meetings for the next programming cycle and to identify areas of improvement in their revised Prospecti. The reports of the external reviewers are available for internal Centre use from the Evaluation Unit either in hard copy or on its intranet site.

## APPENDICES

### Evaluation Reports Received by the Evaluation Unit, 1999/2000

Besides the 12 External Reviews from the Centres' Programs Initiatives, the Evaluation Unit received 18 new reports over the past year. Copies of the reports can be obtained from the Evaluation Unit or the Library.

<b>Title, Author, Date</b>	<b>Related Program Areas</b>	<b>Projects Covered</b>	<b>Country/Region</b>
<b>Project and Program Evaluations</b>			
Unganisha: An Assessment of Results and Effectiveness. June 1999. By Michael Graham.	ICTs	Within Centre Activities	
A Report on PAN-Supported Internet Services Providers. By Carlos A. Afonso February 1999.	ICTs	98-4214, 98-8003, 96-0015, 91-0136, 96-8002, 86-0162, 91-0178, 94-8008, 95-5020	Mongolia, Vietnam, Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Bangladesh, SriLanka
Central America Industrial Support Network - The CAISNET Evaluation. By Isla Paterson. December 1998.	SEE	98-4009	Central America

Urban Agriculture Research in Africa: Reviewing and Enhancing Project Impacts by Luc J. A. Mougeot, Spring 1999.	NRM	88-0325, 93-4140, 95-0007,  93-0024, 96-0013, 82-0114,  97-4002, 90-0153, 93-0037.	Uganda, Zimbabwe, Ghana, Kenya, South Africa, Senegal, Tanzania
Mid-Term Review: Wetland Production Systems Research Project, Bhutan by Hans Schreier, Urs Scheidegger and A. Gomez. October 1998.	NRM	95-8005	Bhutan
People and Resource Dynamics in Mountain Watersheds of the Hindu Kush-Himalayas (PARDYP) - Review Mission Report by Brian Carson, Christine Grieder and Narpat S. Jodha.  March 1999	NRM	96-1300	China, Pakistan, India, Nepal.
Women Test Plot Activities of the NAGALAND Environment Protection & Economic Development Project. By Kavita Rai. December 1999	NRM	94-8308, 94-5332	India
Nagaland Environmental Protection and Economic Development Project. Performance Assessment. By Richard Baerg, Surendra Kumar Vettivel, and Dipa Singh Bagai. February 2000.	NRM	Special Project	India
Evaluación del proyecto sistemas de producción de animales menores en el hogar en el Perú by Instituto Nacional de Investigación Agropecuaria (INIA) Dr Pomareda.  March 1999.	NRM	93-0028	Peru
Tanzania Essential Health Intervention Project (TEHIP) - Evaluation Report to IDRC and the MOH by Cleopas S. Msuya, Mohamed Amri, Peter Ilomo and Mastidia Kahatano May 1999.	SEE	93-0226	Tanzania
La recherche en politiques sociales: Evaluation des capacités institutionnelles. par Ghyslaine Neill, et Souleymane Ouattara, Mai 1993	SEE	Program Level	Gambia, Sierra Leone, Ghana, Nigeria, Burkina Faso, Mali, Senegal,

			Benin, Cameron.
Resource Expansion: "PAN's Experience and Linkages with Private Sector Partners". Allison Murray. June 15, 1999.	ICTs		Sri Lanka, Vietnam, Mongolia
Twenty Years of IDRC Project Support in the Central Andes of Peru and Bolivia: Evaluation Report. By Edward Weber and Martin Mujica, December 1999.	NRM	78-0133, 82-0091, 86-0124,  84-0193, 92-8753, 94-0014,  97-8754, 96-8761, 76-0078,  80-0015, 85-0012, 91-0005,  83-0209, 87-0334, 88-0023,  85-0182, 89-0115, 93-0028,  80-0109, 85-0253, 89-0040,  82-0165, 76-0144, 80-0058,  85-0122, 87-0182, 90-0137,  86-0296, 87-0165, 50215	Peru, Bolivia
Agricultura Urbana en América Latina y el Caribe: Impactos de Proyectos de Investigación. Julio Prudencio Böhrh Mayo 1999	NRM	85-0203, 95-0024, 97-0008,  93-0028, 85-0203	LAC
NEPED Self-Assessment Report. By NEPED Project Team. December 1999	NRM	94-8308, 94-5332	India
An Assessment of Twenty Years of Research Collaboration Between China and The International Development Research Centre. By Geoffrey Oldham, Tan Say Yin, Zhan Hongqi and Zheng	NRM, SEE	81-0130, 84-0273, 85-0023,  85-0251, 86-0098,	China

Yongqi. 1999		86-0246,  87-0127, 87-0329, 88-0100,  02857, 87-0260, 82- 0144,  86-1046, 91-1037, 83-0341,  87-0314, 88-0123, 90-1009,  84-0291, 86-1013, 02146	
Les processus de décentralisation et leurs incidences sur les services sociaux en Afrique de l'Ouest et centrale. By Pierre Basso. December 1999	SEE	97-0209	West and Central Africa
Evaluation of the Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA). By Daniel Bromeley and Gelia Castillo, February 2000.	SEE, NRM	Program Level	Southeast Asia
<b>External Reviews of Program Initiatives</b>			
Assessment of Social Policy Reforms: A Review of the ASPR Program Initiative of IDRC, by Jan Loubser and Naresh Singh. July 1999	SEE		Global
Cities Feeding People: A Review of the CFP Program Initiative of IDRC, by Anne Whyte and Fiona Mackenzie. July, 1999	NRM		Africa and Latin America
Community-Based Natural Resource Management: A Review of the CBNRM Program Initiative of IDRC, by Jacques Chevalier and Hans Schreier	NRM		Asia
Ecosystems Approaches to Human Health: A Review of the ECOHEALTH Program Initiative of IDRC. By Jean-Pierre Reveret and N. Ole Nielsen, June 1999.	NRM		Global

Micro Impact of Macroeconomic and Adjustment Policies: A Review of the MIMAP Program Initiative of IDRC. By Vijay S. Vyas and Marilyn Carr. June 1999	SEE		Asia and Africa
PAN-Asia Networking: A Review of the PAN Program Initiative of IDRC. By Michael Graham and Nabil Harfoush, June 1999	ICTs		Asia and LAC.
People, Land and Water: A Review of the PLaW Program Initiative of IDRC. By Fiona Mackenzie and Greg Spendjian, June 1999	NRM		Asia and the Middle East
Alternative Approaches to Natural Resources Management in Latin America and the Caribbean: A Review of the MINGA Program Initiative of IDRC. By Mauricio R. Bellon and Jacques Chevalier, June 1999.	NRM		LAC
Peace Building and Reconstruction: A Review of the PBR Program Initiative of IDRC. By David Gillies and Hal Klepak, July 1999	SEE		Global
Small, Medium and Micro-Enterprises and Innovation Technology: A Review of the SMMEIT Program Initiative of IDRC. By Marilyn Carr and David Kaplan, June 1999	SEE		Africa and LAC
Sustainable Use of Biodiversity: A Review of the SUB Program Initiative of IDRC. By Greg Spendjian and Anne Whyte, June 1999	NRM		Global
Trade, Employment and Competitiveness: A Review of the TEC Program Initiative of IDRC. By Marilyn Carr and Vijay Vyas, June 1999.	SEE		Asia and LAC

**1. *Twenty Years of IDRC Project Support in the Central Andes of Peru and Bolivia. Evaluation Report* prepared for the Evaluation Unit and MINGA PI by Edward J. Weber and Martín Mujica. December 1999.**

**2. *An Assessment of Twenty Years of Research Collaboration Between China and the International Development Research Centre* by Zhan Hongqi, Zheng Yongqi, Geoffrey Oldham, and Tan Say Yin, (January 2000).**

**3. From “*Integrated Learning Space: A Different Approach to M&E*” presented by Girish Sohani, Executive Vice-President, BAIF, at the African Evaluation Conference, Nairobi, September 1999.**

**4. *Urban Agriculture Research in Africa: Reviewing and Enhancing Project Impacts* by Luc Mougeot (1999).**

**5. *Agricultura Urbana en América Latina y el Caribe. Impactos de proyectos de investigación.* Julio Prudencio Böhr. (1999) FLACSO.**

**6. *Evaluation of the Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA)*, by Daniel Bromley and Gelia Castillo, February 2000.**

**7. *Women Test Plot Activities of the Nagaland Environment Protection and Economic Development Project* by Kavita Rai, December 1999.**